REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Final Office Action mailed June 18, 2010, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive to that Office Action. Claims 1-4, 7-11, and 21-32 are pending in this Application. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned should it be deemed helpful to facilitate prosecution of the application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1-3, 7, 11, 22, 23, 25-27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman (U.S. Patent No. 6,813,643), hereinafter referred to as Perlman, in view of Futamata (U.S. Patent No. 7,339,954), hereinafter referred to as Futamata. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Futamata in view of Perlman.

Independent claim 1 recites, among other things:

> a demultiplexer in communication with the switch and the data processor configured to process AV payloads both from the separate AV packets of the integrated transport and from the AV signals of the AV only transport, wherein the AV signals of the AV only transport are received directly from the switch and wherein the AV packets associated with the integrated transport are received through a signaling pathway in which the switch outputs the integrated transport associated with the AV packets directly to the data processor and the data processor outputs the AV packets directly to the demultiplexer

None of the references of record disclose or suggest at least this feature of claim 1. The Office Action on page 3 admits that "Perlman is silent as to ... a demultiplexer in communication with the switch and the data processor configured to process AV payloads both from the separate AV packets of the integrated transport and from the AV signals of the AV only transport, wherein the AV signals of the AV only transport are received directly from the switch and wherein the AV packets associated with the integrated transport are received through a signaling pathway in which the switch outputs the integrated transport associated with the AV

packets directly to the data processor and the data processor outputs the AV packets directly to the demultiplexer." However, the Office Action on pages 3 and 4 alleges that Futamata describes this feature of claim 1. (*See;* Office Action, pages 3-4, "Futamata discloses ... a demultiplexer (fig. 2 (6)) in communication with the switch (fig. 2 (4)) and the data processor (fig. 2 (12)) configured to process AV payloads both from the separate AV packets of the integrated transport and from the AV signals of the AV only transport, wherein the AV signals of the AV only transport are received directly from the switch (fig. 2(4)) and wherein the AV packets associated with the integrated transport are received through a signaling pathway in which the switch (fig. 2 (4)) outputs the integrated transport associated with the AV packets directly to the data processor (fig. 2 (12)) and the data processor (fig. 2 (12)) outputs the AV packets directly to the demultiplexer (fig. 2 (6)) (*See;* fig. 2 and col. 7, lines 63-col. 9, line 16).")

Futamata describes a "multiplexing digital broadcast method that can establish a technique which can perfectly obtain a multiplexing digital broadcast data." (*See;* Futamata, Title.) In the method of Futamata, an "input switch 4 switches between the digital data 3 received from the digital demodulation error corrector 2 and an external input 5." (*See;* Futamata, column 8, lines 12-14.) Figure 2 of Futamata shows a switch 4 connected to a demultiplexer 6. Also, a system controller 12 controls the input switch 4 and the demultiplexer 6. (*See;* Futamata, Figure 2.) However, this communication scheme is not equivalent to one in which "the switch outputs the integrated transport associated with the AV packets directly to the data processor and the data processor outputs the AV packets directly to the demultiplexer," as claimed. In the scheme of Futamata, controller 12 provides data to switch 4, but the switch 4 does not output data to the controller 12. Thus, the scheme cannot support an architecture in which "the switch outputs the integrated transport associated with the AV packets directly to the data processor and the data processor outputs the AV packets directly to the demultiplexer," as claimed.

None of the references of record (Chelehmal, Lu, etc.) remedy this deficiency of Futamata and Perlman, and for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 distinguishes over the references of record and is in condition for allowance. Claims 2-3, 7, 11, and 22-23 depend from independent claim 1 and are in condition for

allowance at least due to their dependence on an allowable claim as well as the features they recite.

Independent claims 21 and 25 have also been amended to recite a feature similar to the feature discussed above for independent claim 1. Hence, for reasons similar to those presented above in support of claim 1, Applicants submit that independent claims 21 and 25 are in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 26-27 and 29 depend on independent claim 25 and are in condition for allowance at least due to their dependence on an allowable claim as well as the features they recite.

Claims 4, 24 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman, and Futamata as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Chelehmal (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0046406), hereinafter referred to as Chelehmal. Chelehmal does not cure the deficiencies discussed above for Futamata and Perlman. Dependent claims 4 and 24 depend on independent claim 1 and are in condition for allowance at least due to their dependence on an allowable claim as well as the features they recite. Dependent claim 28 depends on independent claim 25 and is in condition for allowance at least due to its dependence on an allowable claim as well as the features it recites.

Claims 8-10 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman and Futamata as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Lu (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0179610, hereinafter referred to as Lu. Lu does not cure the deficiencies discussed above for Futamata and Perlman. Dependent claims 8-10 depend on independent claim 1 and are in condition for allowance at least due to their dependence on an allowable claim as well as the features they recite. Dependent claims 30-32 depend on independent claim 25 and are in condition for allowance at least due to their dependence on an allowable claim as well as the features they recite.

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests issuance of a notice of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: August 18, 2010

By: /Surendra K. Ravula/

Surendra K. Ravula
Registration No. 65,588
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 South Wacker Drive
Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001